

## **WARREN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

**COMMITTEE: COUNTY FACILITIES**

**DATE: FEBRUARY 26, 2008**

---

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: OTHERS PRESENT:**

SUPERVISORS	HASKELL	REPRESENTING SIEMENS BUILDING TECHNOLOGIES, INC.:
	O'CONNOR	TOM GARRETT
	THOMAS	MARK DURANT
	CHAMPAGNE	WILLIAM LAMY, DPW SUPERINTENDENT
	VANNESS	JEFFREY TENNYSON, DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING SERVICES
		FREDERICK MONROE, CHAIRMAN

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

SUPERVISORS	GIRARD	PAUL DUSEK, COUNTY ATTORNEY
	GOODSPEED	HAL PAYNE, COMMISSIONER OF ADMINISTRATIVE & FISCAL SERVICES
		JOAN SADY, CLERK OF THE BOARD
		KEVIN GERAGHTY, BUDGET OFFICER
		SUPERVISOR STRAINER
		SUPERVISOR TESSIER
		FRED AUSTIN, BUILDING PROJECT COORDINATOR
		JULIE PACYNA, PURCHASING AGENT
		TODD LUNT, DIRECTOR, HUMAN SERVICES
		TOM RANDALL, <i>THE ADIRONDACK JOURNAL</i>
		GEORGE THURSTON, PARTNERSHIP SALES OPERATION
		CHARLENE DiRESTA, LEGISLATIVE OFFICE SPECIALIST

---

Mr. Haskell called the meeting of the County Facilities Committee to order at 1:55 p.m.

Motion was made by Mr. VanNess, seconded by Mr. Champagne and carried unanimously to approve the minutes of the previous Committee meeting, subject to correction by the Clerk of the Board.

Privilege of the floor was extended to William Lamy, Superintendent of the Department of Public Works (DPW), who distributed copies of his Agenda packet to the Committee members; *a copy of the Agenda packet is on file with the minutes.*

Mr. Lamy apprised that Frank Morehouse, Superintendent of Buildings & Grounds, had previously presented to the Committee, a proposal from Energy Curtailment Specialists that had the potential of saving the County money by operating the emergency generator at peak hours. He added that the savings could be approximately \$9,000 per year. He stated that Energy Curtailment Specialists would be willing to give a presentation at a Committee or Board meeting to explain

how the program worked. Mr. Haskell noted that if the County went off the grid during peak hours in order to run on power from the emergency generator, they would be charged a tariff by National Grid. He added that he was unsure of when the peak hours were and Tom Garrett, of Siemens Building Technologies, Inc., replied that peak hours were from 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. Mr. Haskell stated that the residents of Courthouse Estates would not appreciate the noise that would come from running the diesel generator during that time period. He added that he did not feel that a savings of \$9,000 per year would be worth the aggravation or the wear and tear that it would put on the generator. He noted that the generator was expensive and should last the County approximately 20 years with periodic usage; however, he added, if the generator was operated every day for three hours, it would need to be replaced sooner than expected. Mr. Champagne advised that it was too much of a risk to save only \$9,000 per year. It was the consensus of the Committee to reject the proposal from Energy Curtailment Specialists to give a presentation to the Committee to explain their program.

Mr. Lamy stated that the next item on the Agenda pertained to the request from Countryside Adult Home for the generator currently located at the Municipal Center Annex. He noted that the generator that was currently at Countryside Adult Home was only 32 kilowatts and was not capable of generating enough power for the entire building; however, he added, it did generate enough power for a substantial portion of the building. He stated that Siemens Building Technologies, Inc. had done a complete update on the controls of the generator and it was now in good working order. He added that the generator had been recently serviced and had a new battery and block heater installed. He stated that it was the recommendation of the DPW that the generator currently located at Countryside Adult Home was adequate for their use. Hal Payne, Commissioner of Administrative & Fiscal Services, said that about a month prior, he had requested that the Department Heads submit requests for appropriations from Congresswoman Gillibrand's Office. He added that Brenda Hayes, Director of Countryside Adult Home, had submitted a request for a new generator at a cost of \$70,000. He said the request had been included with the applications submitted to the Congresswoman's Office on Friday, February 22, 2008. Mr. Haskell asked the size of the generator that had been requested and Mr. Payne replied that he was unsure. Mr. Haskell asked the size of the generator currently located at the Municipal Center Annex and Mr. Lamy replied that he was unsure. Mr. Haskell advised that the Committee should discuss this issue further at the next Committee meeting.

Mr. Lamy said that representatives from Siemens Building Technologies, Inc. (Siemens) were present to give a presentation on standardizing energy, fire and security services. Mr. Haskell noted that when the Public Safety Building had been constructed, the Sheriff's Office had ceased handling the fire and security alarms

for the County. He added that at that point all fire and security contracts were transferred to Mahoney Notify-Plus, Inc. He stated that Sheriff York had been asked if the Sheriff's Office would be able to handle the fire and security calls for the County and had replied that he would be agreeable provided that the equipment was compatible. Mr. Haskell explained that when a fire or security alarm was activated, a call would be made directly to the Sheriff's Communication Center, as opposed to the call going to Mahoney Notify-Plus, Inc., who would then call 911. He apprised that they were researching the installation of a new fire alarm system for the DPW Maintenance Shop located in the Town of Warrensburg and had considered standardizing the equipment in all Warren County buildings.

Mr. Garrett distributed copies of a Municipality Standardization Justification Document to the Committee members, a copy of which is on file with the minutes. He noted that General Municipal Law Section 103 gave municipalities the opportunity to purchase contracts for public works projects based on the assumption that it would be fiscally responsible to use a single vendor for certain highly technical and sophisticated systems. He added that if one company was used for maintenance of fire, security and controls for energy automation it would save the County money. He stated that the fire and security components could be integrated into the existing energy automation platform. He added that there would be significant savings due to one central-based computer system in the Municipal Center building that could tie into and support the other County buildings. He said that there would be additional savings due to the fact that there would be one hub that would carry all of the information, as opposed to three. He apprised that another advantage would be that the County personnel would only need to be trained on one system. He added that there would be the ability to expand the system so that it could be monitored from a laptop computer. He said the system could also be expanded to monitor the level of carbon monoxide in the air.

Paul Dusek, County Attorney, apprised that General Municipal Law Section 103 allowed municipalities to standardize equipment of a particular manufacturer providing that a savings in cost or efficiency could be demonstrated. He added that it would also require more than the majority vote of the Board of Supervisors (2/3 or 3/5 vote). He said that a particular manufacturer could be specified; however, he added, the project would still be put out to bid, as usual. Mr. Garrett noted that the Siemens equipment was on State contract. Mr. VanNess explained that currently when an alarm went off the call would go to Mahoney Notify-Plus, Inc., who then called the Sheriff's Communication Center and the Fire Department, as well as the necessary Departmental personnel. He said that he felt this issue should be referred to the Public Safety Committee to ensure that the Sheriff was aware that the Sheriff's Communication Center would be responsible for all notification for the alarms. Mr. Haskell stated that Sheriff York had been informed of what the new procedure would entail and was in favor of the proposal.

Mr. Garrett apprised that Siemens would work with the County so that each location would have a complete list of the people who would receive notification. Mr. VanNess said that Mahoney Notify-Plus, Inc. currently called the necessary emergency personnel as well as the Departmental personnel. Mr. Champagne asked where the location of the service office for this equipment was and Mark Durant, of Siemens Building Technologies, Inc., responded that the office was in Latham, New York, with resident specialists in Schuylerville, New York and technicians in Saratoga, New York.

Mr. Garrett noted that Siemens Apogee EMS (Energy Management System) had been installed at Countryside Adult Home, Westmount Health Facility and the Municipal Center. He added that they had also been awarded the bid for the Warrensburg DPW Maintenance Shop and might be able to carry the cost of fire and security within that performance contract. Mr. Champagne asked for clarification and Mr. Garrett responded that Siemens was currently reviewing a performance contract for the DPW Maintenance Shop and it appeared that the project would generate enough potential savings that it might allow Siemens to carry the cost of the incremental components for the fire and security for the DPW Maintenance Shop.

In regard to the notification process, Mr. Durant apprised that Siemens' system had a component called RENO which had the ability to send out a page or an email, as well as to place a phone call. Chairman Monroe expounded that in most standardization scenarios there would be more than one vender available; however, he added, that in this situation it seemed like Siemens would be the only available vender. Mr. Dusek questioned if Siemens was on State contract and Mr. Garrett replied affirmatively. Mr. Dusek apprised that the successful bidder for the installation of the equipment could be a company other than Siemens and Mr. Garrett agreed. Mr. Dusek explained that although Siemens would benefit as the manufacturer of the product, there could be multiple vendors of that product who would bid on the project. He added that this situation would be permissible under law, as long as the County had the opportunity to put the installation and service of the equipment out to bid.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Dusek noted that the County would need to justify the standardization. He asked if the County currently had any Siemens fire, safety and security systems in any of the County buildings and Mr. Garrett replied in the negative. Mr. Dusek questioned why the County should not do a Request for Proposal (RFP) to all the companies who handle fire, safety and security systems to see who had the best system at the best price. Mr. Durant replied that the Sheriff's Office had received a grant from the Department of Homeland Security that needed to be expended

quickly. He added that whether or not Siemens products were used, it was preferable that all the buildings have standardized equipment. He explained that Siemens had already provided the County with energy services and an automatic control system and he added, that they could also provide the fire and security systems. Mr. Dusek reiterated that the County would need justification as to why they should only use Siemens products. He explained that if the County already had Siemens products in a building and it became important to have one standardized system, that would provide a strong argument as to why the County should bid out the next building for the same standardized equipment. Mr. Champagne asked if Siemens had been awarded the bid for the proposed Health and Human Services Building and Mr. Durant replied in the negative. Mr. Durant noted that the County would need to make a decision quickly with regard to the Department of Homeland Security Grant. Mr. Champagne said that there were other manufacturers of fire and security products that were also on State contract.

Mr. Strainer exited the meeting at 2:17 p.m.

Mr. Dusek stated that Mr. Payne had just informed him that Siemens products had been used for the heating and cooling systems at the Municipal Center and he asked if those systems tied into the fire and security systems. Mr. Garrett responded that the central control system or platform for the heating and cooling system was already in place and the fire and security systems would be put on the existing platform. Mr. Dusek noted that there would then be an advantage to standardizing and utilizing Siemens products for all of the systems. Mr. Garrett responded that there would be a financial advantage and added that he would develop a spreadsheet for the Committee that would detail the financial savings. Mr. Haskell noted that the Siemens heating controls were in four of the County buildings (Municipal Center, Westmount Health Facility, Countryside Adult Home and DPW Maintenance Shop). Chairman Monroe asked if the State contract was just for an add-on system or for stand-alone systems as well, and Mr. Garrett replied it was for both. Mr. Dusek stated that if the County wanted to standardize, the decision needed to be reached prior to the bids going out on the proposed Health and Human Services Building. Mr. Haskell noted that the \$46,000 Department of Homeland Security Grant needed to be expended prior to June 30, 2008. Mr. Champagne asked where the security system that would be purchased with the grant funding would be placed and Mr. Haskell replied that it was intended for the Municipal Center.

Mr. Champagne suggested that the Committee should talk to the engineer for the Health and Human Services Building to see if they were planning on using Siemens products. Mr. Haskell responded that they had met with the engineer and determined that he did not have a preference on which system was used. Mr.

Thomas asked what the potential savings would be for the County if they were to standardize and Mr. Garrett replied that the computer which operated the heating and cooling system for the Municipal Center would also operate the systems for the Health and Human Services Building, which would save \$50,000. Mr. Payne noted that the County had not decided how much of the Municipal Center would be secured using the grant funding. He added that there had been discussions pertaining to securing the basement only or securing all entrances except the main entrance and the Department of Motor Vehicles entrance.

Mr. Champagne said that he was unsure of how far \$46,000 would take the County with regard to standardization. Chairman Monroe apprised that it was premature for the County to discuss standardization and added that if the County were to obtain several of the Siemens systems then it would make sense to start discussing standardization. He said that the decision for the security of the Municipal Center could be reached without making the decision to standardize all County buildings. Mr. Thomas asked how much had been spent on the heating and cooling system for the Municipal Center and Mr. Garrett replied that it was approximately \$2 million. Mr. Thomas asked how much had been spent just on the central control system and Mr. Garrett replied approximately \$200,000. Mr. Thomas apprised that if the County went with a different vendor, a separate central control system would be needed and Mr. Garrett responded that the County would duplicate what had already been spent.

Chairman Monroe stated that the County could select Siemens for the security system for the Municipal Center and utilize the central control system already in place without making a decision to standardize all County buildings.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Tessier exited the meeting at 2:26 p.m.

Mr. Champagne agreed that it made sense to standardize; however, he added, there might be other manufacturers with products that were less expensive than Siemens products. Mr. Haskell noted that Siemens was on State contract and Mr. Champagne replied that there were probably two dozen other manufacturers that were also on State contract. Mr. Garrett stated that Siemens would not be the lowest bidder on State contract due to the level of service that they provided to their customers. He added that the County had invested in a number of energy management control systems with Siemens and now had the opportunity to standardize. Mr. O'Connor said that the County did not always have to award the contract to the lowest bidder and added that they chose the best service for the best price. Julie Pacyna, Purchasing Agent, apprised that the County should review the value analysis prior to adopting the standardization. Mr. Champagne

said that he felt uncomfortable moving forward without seeing the value analysis. Mrs. Pacyna stated that the County would need the analysis due to the fact that the resolution would need to justify why the lowest bidder had not been selected. Mr. Haskell questioned how long it would take to prepare the value analysis and Mr. Garrett responded that he could have it in a couple of weeks. It was the consensus of the Committee that a special meeting should be held on Wednesday, March 12, 2008 at 11:30 a.m. to review the value analysis that would be presented by representatives from Siemens Building Technologies, Inc.

Messrs. Garrett and Durant exited the meeting at 2:34 p.m.

Mr. Lamy stated that he was requesting to amend the contracts for the Westmount Health Facility air handlers project. He said that Mr. Morehouse had put this item on the Agenda and had listed one contract to be extended with Monahan and Loughlin and another listed to extend all contracts. Mr. Payne noted that the delay was a result of the closing of Rist-Frost Associates and waiting for Dan Bruno, former Chief Engineer for Rist-Frost Associates, to get signed on with Highlander Engineering Services, PLLC. Mr. Lamy said that the start date had also been delayed due to the weather. Mr. Payne apprised that they were supposed to proceed on Monday, February 26, 2008; however, he added, they were delayed again because Mr. Bruno had not been contracted yet. Mr. Lamy questioned why the contract needed to be extended and Joan Sady, Clerk of the Board, replied that it had been a 73-day contract and the amendment would be for a time extension to complete the work.

Mr. Champagne said that this project had been going on for some time and suggested that the contractor needed to be encouraged to complete the project. Mr. Payne explained that the County had to stop the contractor from proceeding with the project due to the fact that there was no engineer on staff. Mr. Champagne stated that he thought the County had negotiated \$3,000 for Mr. Bruno to complete the project and Mr. Lamy responded that the contract had not been finalized. Mr. Lamy said that the contractor was ready to proceed; however, he added, the current issue was with administration of the contract. He apprised that DPW should be involved in all construction projects within the County. He added all building projects within the County should be referred to the County Facilities Committee and go through Public Works. Mr. Geraghty noted that Rist-Frost Associates had been under contract with the County through the DPW. Mr. Payne added that the County had signed the initial agreement for this project on December 16, 2006. He added that Mr. Morehouse had been on board since the beginning of the project and had been present at every meeting. He said that Rist-Frost Associates had been under contract with the County and it had been recommended that they be used for the air handler project. Mr. Haskell suggested that there be a policy stating that any building project over a certain dollar

amount be approved through the County Facilities Committee.

Mr. Champagne stated that the County needed to develop an organizational chart that showed DPW and every building in the County should have a representative that reported to DPW. Mr. Payne responded that system was already in place and had been for the last three years. Mr. Champagne asked what had gone wrong on this project and Mr. Payne replied that the project had been placed in Rist-Frost Associates' hands and they dropped the ball for over a year. Mr. VanNess apprised that another issue had been the transition between the previous Superintendent of DPW and the current one. Mr. Geraghty noted that there needed to be an increase in communication between the Departments. Mr. Dusek suggested that Mr. Payne send a memo to all Department Heads stating that all building projects had to be approved through DPW. Mr. Champagne suggested that the individual employees in charge of each of the buildings should meet once every four to six weeks to communicate. Mr. Haskell said that he would meet with Mr. Lamy to work on setting up those meetings. Mrs. Pacyna said that she often received calls from Department Heads asking questions pertaining to building specifications, which she then referred to Mr. Lamy. Mr. Dusek stated that the organizational structure was already in place and it was a matter of ensuring that the Department Heads followed the structure.

Motion was made by Mr. VanNess, seconded by Mr. Champagne and carried unanimously to extend all contracts pertaining to the air handlers project at the Westmount Health Facility. *A copy of the resolution request is on file with the minutes and the necessary resolution was authorized for the March 21, 2008 Board meeting.*

Mr. Lamy stated that he was requesting to amend Resolution No. 711 of 2007 with regard to Amendment No. 2 to the Performance Contracting Agreement with Siemens Building Technologies, Inc., relative to the Municipal Center Project and to authorize the Chairman to execute Amendment No. 3. He added that the original resolution listed an incorrect number of heat pumps and had not included the authorization for the Chairman to execute Amendment No. 3. Mr. Dusek stated that the original contract had listed 157 heat pumps and had been amended to 159 heat pumps. He added that additional studies had been completed and it had been determined that the correct number of heat pumps needed would be 158. He said that the number was now correct and the contract with Siemens was now finalized.

Motion was made by Mr. VanNess, seconded by Mr. Thomas and carried unanimously to amend Resolution No. 711 of 2007, as outlined above and to authorize the Chairman to execute Amendment No. 3. *A copy of the resolution request is on file with the minutes and the necessary resolution was authorized for the March 21, 2008 Board meeting.*



Mr. Lamy said that there was a list of the referrals for this Committee included in the Agenda, a copy of which is on file with the minutes. He stated that Item Nos. 4, 5 and 6 could be deleted. He asked if Item No. 8 was completed and Mr. Haskell replied that the generator would continue to be a pending item, as discussed earlier in the meeting. Mr. Payne noted that Item No. 8 was listed incorrectly and added that the generator was not from Westmount Health Facility, it was from the Department of Social Services.

Mr. Haskell said that he wanted to give the Committee an update on the Health and Human Services Building. He apprised that Fred Austin, Building Projects Coordinator, Mr. Payne, Chairman Monroe, Mr. Dusek and he had met with representatives from Bovis Lend Lease LMB, Inc. (Bovis) and Clark Patterson Associates (CPA). He said that the County had requested cost estimates for the proposed Health and Human Services Building, assuming the following options:

- ▶ With a geothermal heating and cooling system;
- ▶ With a basement; and
- ▶ With preparation for a future 4<sup>th</sup> floor.

Mr. Haskell noted that if a geothermal heating and cooling system was installed in the proposed building the initial costs would be more expensive; however, he added, cooling towers and boilers would not be needed and it was probable that grant funding would be available to cover the increase in costs. He stated that although a geothermal heating and cooling system would initially cost more, Bovis and CPA would provide the County with a cost breakdown that would show that in approximately ten years the County would save money. He noted that the proposed building could be tied into the geothermal system for the Municipal Center building to make it more efficient. He stated that the engineer should have the requested estimates in approximately one month.

Mr. Dusek expounded that the County had originally put out an RFP for engineering and construction management services for a designated project to construct a 98,000 square foot building on the site of the Municipal Center Annex, as well as renovations to the Municipal Center. He added that the County had entered into contracts with Bovis and CPA based on that RFP. He said that the County had decided not to proceed with the renovations to the Municipal Center and added that additional studies had been completed for various other sites as possible locations for the proposed building which had required contract amendments for up to \$20,000 each time. He apprised that last fall CPA had done additional design studies at the request of the Project Core Team for approximately \$20,000, which still required a resolution to authorize the payment. He said that in the meantime, Bovis had been paid for preconstruction services under the old contract. He explained that now that the County had decided to place the proposed building on the Municipal Center campus, Bovis and CPA had requested contract revisions. He said that the fees for the new site were

approximately the same as they had been for the site of the Municipal Center Annex. He stated that he had received a letter from CPA that explained that both schematic design and design development were slightly less than had been contracted for the original building, which had been attributed to the restructuring to place more funds into the construction phase. He apprised that although there was a decrease in the cost of the design phase, the project would now require two separate bid packages, as opposed to one, which would increase the cost to the bid phase of the project. He noted that CPA had advised that their construction services would be higher than the original contract, due to the following reasons:

- ▶ The savings from the design services had been allocated to construction services;
- ▶ The two construction phases would spread out their services over a longer period of time; and
- ▶ The original fee for construction services was based on the original RFP, which had included an addition and interior renovations at the Municipal Center and it had been anticipated that there would be a savings in the cost of the construction services from these concurrent construction phases.

Mr. Dusek noted that the letter from CPA had been at his request and he had reviewed the project fees with CPA. He added that CPA's base fee for the project was now \$968,000 for the construction of the proposed Health and Human Services building. He said that if the County wanted CPA to demolish the Municipal Center Annex, it would cost an additional \$77,000. He advised that he felt that CPA was correct in their fees and added that he was surprised that there had not been an increase in the cost per hour.

Mr. Dusek apprised that Bovis' fees were substantially higher and added that the fee would include an additional \$1 million for construction management. He said that Bovis had projected that preconstruction on the original plans would take six months; however, he added, for the current plans they were projecting eight months. He said that one of the reasons they had mentioned was due to the dual bidding phase taking additional time. He stated that design service and construction service fees for Bovis had also increased. He added that Bovis had projected the entire project to take 18 months for the original plans and now they were projecting 36 months. He said that the justification that had been given by Bovis was that due to the way the project was developed it would require a longer construction period. He noted that Bovis was very rigid and he was unsure of how the final negotiations would end.

Mr. VanNess noted that Bovis had been involved with the project since the beginning; however, he questioned, if it was time to look elsewhere for a

construction manager. Mr. Dusek responded that the County had a lot invested in working with Bovis and it would be difficult to switch to another company at this point. Mr. Haskell apprised that Bovis was correct in estimating that the project would take longer. He added that the schematic design on the original plans had been completed prior to Bovis coming on board. Mr. Dusek stated that he would like the opportunity to continue to negotiate with Bovis. Mr. VanNess said that he did not have a problem with the negotiations; however, he added, he wanted to make sure that Bovis did not think they could hold the County hostage. Mr. Dusek apprised that if the Committee was ready, he would like to have the amendment to the contracts approved for the March 21, 2008 Board meeting.

Mr. Geraghty questioned how much the cost estimates for the additional scenarios would cost and Mr. Haskell replied that Bovis had said the cost estimates were included in their fee. Mr. Champagne asked if there would be a charge for the cost estimates from CPA and Mr. Haskell replied that they had not requested cost estimates from CPA for the various scenarios. Mr. Geraghty noted that the cost of this project had increased considerably since the beginning.

Mr. Austin apprised that it had been his impression that Bovis understood the County's desire to have the cost estimates for the alternate designs and that it had been included in the price. Mr. Geraghty questioned if the County had previously asked for a cost estimate for a 4<sup>th</sup> floor and Mr. Austin responded that they had discussed a 4<sup>th</sup> floor but had decided that the building would be too tall and the residents of Courthouse Estates would be opposed to it. Mr. Austin apprised that both Bovis and Siemens had key personnel who resided less than 20 minutes from the Municipal Center.

Motion was made by Mr. VanNess, seconded by Mr. Thomas and carried unanimously to authorize the amendments to the contracts with Bovis Lend Lease LMB, Inc. and Clark Patterson Associates, as outlined by Mr. Dusek for the Health and Human Services Building Project. *A copy of the resolution request form is on file with the minutes and the necessary resolution was authorized for the March 21, 2008 Board meeting.*

As there was no further business to come before the County Facilities Committee, on motion made by Mr. Thomas and seconded by Mr. VanNess, Mr. Haskell adjourned the meeting at 3:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Charlene DiResta, Legislative Office Specialist